



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,472	01/21/2004	Joan Evelyn Conover	SAIC0008-CON1	2030

27510 7590 01/10/2007
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/760,472

Applicant(s)

CONOVER ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q. PHAM

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33 and 36-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33 and 36-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2168

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claim 35 is withdrawn in view of 35 U.S.C. § 101, 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and USP 6,151,624. Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101, 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and USP 6,151,624 follow.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 33 and 42 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6 and 8, of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,314. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

APPLICATION 10/760,472

Claim 33. A system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein;

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords;

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class; and

a computing device for
creating metadata indicative of each of the documents and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date,

further wherein the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index, and

further wherein the characteristics of the

PATENT 6,701,314

Claim 1. A system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories, the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein;

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords;

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class; and

a computing device for
creating metadata indicative of each of the documents as defined by each of the documents' keywords and one or more classes and

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index,

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index; and

further wherein the characteristics of the multiple

multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or more of the documents are accessed using the meta-index.	heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or more of the documents are accessed using the meta-index. Claim 8. The method of claim 6, wherein the metadata information is stored in the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) format.
--	---

Claims 33 and 42 of the current application are obvious over claims 1, 6 and 8 of USP 6,701,314 because XML format as in claim 8 of USP 6,701,314 is a predefined data structure for storing metadata, obviously comprises *at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date* as recited in claim 1 of USP 6,701,314, *metadata indicative of each of the documents as defined by each of the documents' keywords.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 33 and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 33 and 36-45, especially claims 33 and 42, are directed to a system and method for cataloguing documents. This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial

Art Unit: 2168

exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a useful result because the claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility (utilities) is (are) directed to provide more advanced search and retrieval capabilities and permit a user to effectively locate and access information on the Internet (Specification, Page 3 Lines 6-9), the claimed subject matter relates ONLY to *cataloguing the documents in an integrated library* (Claim 33 Line 9, Claim 42 Line 11). The advanced search and retrieval capabilities as asserted in the Specification are not in the claims¹.

The claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for *cataloguing the documents in an integrated library*. This produced result remains in the abstract and, thus, fails to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

¹ The claimed limitation, *such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, is an intended use limitation. Accessing the document has not been performed in the system and method.

Art Unit: 2168

Claims 33 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 33 and 42 recite the limitation *the metadata in a meta-index* in the step of *cataloguing each of the documents*. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 33, 36-40 and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] in view of Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624].

Regarding claim 33, Marques teaches *a system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories* (Marques, Abstract), the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler *a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55).

The missing of Marques' system is *a computing device for creating metadata indicative of each of the documents and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date, further wherein the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index, and further wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or of the documents are accessed using the meta-index.*

Art Unit: 2168

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses *a computing device for*

creating metadata indicative of each of the documents (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name address, URL, a description, a language attribute, a region attribute... As further disclosed by Teare, real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contains an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents*, e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date*);

wherein the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index (As discussed above with respect to the step of cataloguing and as taught by Teare at Col. 2 Lines 11-16, the Index Files as *meta-index* contains URL. An example of URL as in FIG. 1A is <http://home.acme.com>. HTTP is one of characteristic of the multiple heterogeneous repository that stores the document, e.g., Hyper Text Transfer Protocol is used for web browsing. Another characteristic of the multiple heterogeneous repository is the IP address of the multiple heterogeneous repository, e.g., home.acme.com. In different words, the Index Files as taught by Teare indicates the claimed limitation *the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents*. The purpose of is to enable a user *accesses one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index* as disclosed by Teare at Col. 23 Lines 10-22);

wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or of the documents are accessed using the meta-index (As further disclosed by Teare in FIG. 6 (Col. 22 Line 55-Col. 23 Line 22 and Col. 20 Lines 21-28), *the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., URL that contains HTTP and IP address, is easily detected or *transparent to the user* by entering a real name, *when one or of the documents are accessed using the meta-index*, e.g., the index is searched for the URL to return the resource corresponding to the URL).

As strongly suggested by Teare, URLs are difficult to remember (Teare, Col. 2 Line 45). An URL that is accurate one day might be inaccurate the next day, so that the network resource cannot be located (Teare, Col. 2 Lines 63-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare into the Marques technique.

Art Unit: 2168

By defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the network resource can be located easily without the need to remember the URL of the resource.

Regarding claim 42, Marques teaches *a method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories* (Marques, Abstract), comprising:

scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler a scanning tool for *scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));

building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55);

creating identification of the predetermined class (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-57).

The missing of Marques method is the step of *creating metadata information for the documents; and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified*

Art Unit: 2168

date and further wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index, and wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or more of the documents are accessed using the meta-index.

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses the step of

creating metadata for the documents (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata associated with a document or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),*

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued in an integrated library, e.g., Registry 10, according to the metadata in a meta-index, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),*

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is indexed within the meta-index, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, the metadata for*

Art Unit: 2168

each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locator, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date);

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index (As discussed above with respect to the step of cataloguing and as taught by Teare at Col. 2 Lines 11-16, the Index Files as *meta-index* contains URL. An example of URL as in FIG. 1A is <http://home.acme.com>. HTTP is one of characteristic of the multiple heterogeneous repository that stores the document, e.g., Hyper Text Transfer Protocol is used for web browsing. Another characteristic of the multiple heterogeneous repository is the IP address of the multiple heterogeneous repository, e.g., home.acme.com. In different words, the Index Files as taught by Teare indicates the claimed limitation *the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents*. The purpose of is to enable a user *accesses one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index* as disclosed by Teare at Col. 23 Lines 10-22);

wherein the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories are transparent to the user when one or of the documents are accessed using the meta-index (As further disclosed by Teare in FIG. 6 (Col. 22 Line 55-Col. 23 Line 22 and Col. 20 Lines 21-28), *the characteristics of the multiple heterogeneous repositories, e.g., URL that contains HTTP and IP address, is easily detected or transparent to the user by entering a real name, when one or of the documents are accessed using the meta-index, e.g., the index is searched for the URL to return the resource corresponding to the URL).*

As strongly suggested by Teare, URLs are difficult to remember (Teare, Col. 2 Line 45). An URL that is accurate one day might be inaccurate the next day, so that the network resource cannot be located (Teare, Col. 2 Lines 63-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare into the Marques technique. By defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the network resource can be located easily without the need to remember the URL of the resource.

Regarding claims 36 and 44, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33 and 42, Teare further discloses *the metadata is stored in eXensible Markup Language (XML) format* (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 26-34).

Regarding claims 37 and 45, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33 and 42, Teare further discloses *the metadata is stored in Resource Description Framework (RDF) format* (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 38, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses *the scanning tool is at least one spider* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 39, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses *the mapping tool is a domain ontology* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 40, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 39, Marques further discloses *the domain ontology is a classification hierarchy* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 43, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 42, Marques further discloses *scanning the at least one information repository to collect keywords is performed by a spider* (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Claims 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] and Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624] as applied to claim 33, and further in view of Becker [USP 6,301,579 B1].

Regarding to claim 41, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, but fail to disclose *the mapping tool is a neural network*. Becker teaches a method for constructing a decision table classifier (Becker, Abstract). Becker further discloses neural network as a well-known type classifier (Becker, Col. 2, lines 7-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Marques and Teare system by including a neural

Art Unit: 2168


network for classification in order to organize electronic documents for storage and subsequent retrieval.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

January 8, 2007